



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,770	06/11/2001	David M. Aronovitz	SUN-P6047-SH	4711

28422 7590 06/30/2005

HOYT A. FLEMING III
P.O. BOX 140678
BOISE, ID 83714

EXAMINER

DESIR, JEAN WICEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/879,770

Applicant(s)

ARONOVITZ, DAVID M.

Examiner

Jean W. Désir

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2005, Amendment.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 19-47 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakai et al (US 5,973,722).

Claim 1:

Wakai discloses:

“a network adapter”, see Fig. 5 item 526;

“a microprocessor physically and electrically coupled to the network adapter”,
see Fig. 5 item 500;

“a graphics adapter physically and electrically coupled to the microprocessor”,
see Fig. 5 item 530;

“a light valve physically and electrically coupled to the graphics adapter; and a
light source physically coupled to the light valve”, see Fig. 5 items 534, 536;

“a housing (item 500 of Fig. 5), the housing containing at least a portion of the
network adapter, the microprocessor(item PROCESSOR), the graphics adapter, the
light valve, and the light source” (because “*at least a portion of*” is interpreted as not to
be limiting to all the elements recited);

"wherein the video projector is capable of projecting a graphic image onto a screen (items 130,132, 136 of Fig. 1, items 536, 534 of Fig. 5) that is remote from the video projector, is capable of applying Keystone correction to a video frame, and is operable to receive the [video data] video frame in digital form from [the network adapter] a network (526 of Fig. 5) and wherein the video projector is operable to transfer the [video data] video frame to the microprocessor (500 of Fig. 5), the graphics adapter (530 of Fig. 5), and the light valve (534, 536 of Fig. 5) in digital form and wherein the video [data] frame is output from the graphics adapter (530 of Fig. 5) in digital form";

the difference between the claimed invention and Wakai's disclosure is that the Wakai's disclosure does not explicitly show a light valve and light source as claimed, and also Keystone correction is not explicitly taught as claimed. However - Wakai's disclosure shows LCD display (items 534, 536 of Fig. 5) that would have rendered the claimed invention obvious to an artisan, because LCD display based on light valve coupled to light source is a very well known device in the art capable of providing high brightness and efficiency without excessive power consumption - and keystone correction is also a notoriously well known procedure in the art that would reduce trapezoidal distortion of a projected video frame, an artisan would be motivated to implement this existing procedure in Wakai's disclosure because the implementation would reduce trapezoidal distortion of a projected video frame. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 2 is met by Fig. 5 item 504 which is a power supply as claimed.

Art Unit: 2614

Claims 3, 4 are disclosed, see Fig. 5 item 526, col. 13 line 57.

Claims 8, 9 are obvious to an artisan because of the LCD display (items 534, 536) as explained in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 2, and the power supply (item 504) is operable to supply power to network adaptor, the microprocessor, the graphics adapter and the light valve as claimed.

Claims 11-13 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2-4.

Claims 17, 18 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8, 9.

Claim 5:

The claimed limitation “wherein the network adapter is operable to receive and send data packets that are formatted in accordance with the SUN RAY protocol” is not explicitly disclosed by Wakai’s disclosure, because Wakai does not explicitly teach SUN RAY protocol commands. However, Wakai would have rendered the claimed invention obvious to an artisan, because Wakai suggests that other types of network could alternatively be used for communications (see col. 21 lines 57-58); thus, other types of network that use different protocol commands are at level of one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5.

Claim 6:

The claimed limitation “wherein the microprocessor contains circuitry that is operable to receive and process a SET command, a BITMAP command, a FILL command, a COPY command, and a CSCS command from the network adapter” is not

explicitly disclosed by Wakai's disclosure, because Wakai does not explicitly teach the commands: SET, BITMAP, FILL, COPY, and CSCS, as claimed. However, microprocessor that is operable to receive and/or process these commands are very well known in the art, or the operation of these commands are at level of an artisan. Therefore, implementation of these commands in Wakai's disclosure would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention was made, because their operation are readily available to the designer.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6.

3. Claims 7, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakai et al (US 5,973,722) in view of Wang et al (US 5,928,327).

Claim 7:

The claimed limitation "wherein the video projector also includes an input device and wherein the microprocessor contains circuitry that is operable to receive data from the input device and, based upon the data, send a video modification command to the network adapter" is not explicitly disclosed by Wakai's disclosure. However, Wang discloses the claimed invention, Wang includes input device that sends VCR-like control commands or video modification commands over a client-server network (see Wang at col. 8 lines 16-32), Wakai in view of Wang would have rendered the claimed invention obvious; an artisan would be motivated to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention, this combination would provide a way to control various aspects of the video image over the network. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 11 and 12 of the REMARKS, Applicant argues that Wakai does not disclose "video is output from the graphics adapter (530 of Fig. 5) in digital form". These argument are not persuasive; the graphics adapter (530) does output video in digital form, because the graphics adapter is a MPEG DEC VGA and all communications across the Wakai's disclosure are transmitted as digital data (see col. 3 lines 47-49, col. 4 lines 43-44).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 19-47 are allowed.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2614

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean W. Désir whose telephone number is (703) 308 9571. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 - First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on (703) 305 4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWD

Jun. 15, 05


JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600